

Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement sheets for Figs. 1-10 are enclosed which formalize the drawings which were submitted with the application. No other changes have been made.

REMARKS

Applicants submit herewith replacement sheets which formalize the drawings currently on file. No other changes have been made. Approval by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Applicants affirm the election of the claims of Group 1, claims 1-6 with traverse which was made in a phone call with the Examiner on May 10, 2005.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Lee et al.

Claim 1 is believed to be representative of the independent claims in this application. Independent claim 2 includes the feature of claim 1 that the edge taper region is less than 8 microns and also specifies corner radii of less than 6 microns. Claim 4 is similar to claim 1 but specifies that the spaced relationship of the donor from the laterally spaced electrodes is less than 10 microns. It is an important feature of the claims in this application, that the lateral electrodes can be closely spaced to each other because of the fact that the taper edge region is less than 8 microns. Table 1 demonstrates this feature.

The present invention recognizes that the donor must be in a particular spaced relationship with the lateral electrodes to achieve a taper region of 8 microns or less. As set forth on page 25, lines 3-7, the spaced relationship is defined to mean in direct contact or having a gap of a controlled separation of less than 10 microns of the donor from the electrodes. As also discussed on page 24 lines 26-page 25 line 2, the material transferred from the donor is in an all or nothing situation. Clearly to have the transferred organic layer provided with a flat surface, all of the material must be transferred. Lee et al discuss laser beam power profiles. Assuming for the sake of argument, that it is desirable to have a flattened beam profile, there still will be taper edge regions due to material spreading during transfer from the donor to the receiver. Lee et al have no discussion on how to minimize these tapered regions caused by material spreading. There is no discussion in Lee et al of the dimensions of their tapered regions nor of the separation between their donor and the electrodes. Clearly, Lee et al did not recognize an effective way to reduce these taper regions. It would not have been obvious to use the spaced relationship of the present

invention as noted above. Applicants believe that the Examiner is using an obvious to try approach without anything in Lee et al to suggest the present invention. This is clearly an erroneous test.

Independent claims 1, 2 and 4 are believed to define unobvious subject matter in view of Lee et al. The remaining dependent claims are believed to be allowable with their base claim.

If there is any problems with this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call. In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Owens', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.